

KAUKA30001732026



**IN THE COURT OF 1ST ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
COURT, KARWAR, (SITTING AT SIRSI) AT SIRSI,
UTTARA KANNADA**

**PRESENT : KIRAN KINI,
1st ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
KARWAR, SITTING AT SIRSI**

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

CRL. MISC. NO. 5058/2026

1. Shridhar Parshuram Pawar,
Age : 24 years, Occ: Coolie,
R/o.Khamadolli, Tq: Haliyal,
Dist: Uttara Kannada.
2. Pradeep Balakrishna Bishtekar,
Age : 23 years, Occ: Coolie,
R/o.Khamadolli, Tq: Haliyal,
Dist: Uttara Kannada.
3. Sumit Laxman Ghadi,
Age : 22 years, Occ: Driver,
R/o.Khamadolli, Tq: Haliyal,
Dist: Uttara Kannada.
4. Karthik Pundlik Dharwadkar,
Age : 25 years, Occ: Agriculturist,
R/o.Khamadolli, Tq: Haliyal,
Dist: Uttara Kannada.
5. Sagar Balakrishna Pawar
@ Babi Balakrishna Pawar,
Age : 27 years, Occ: Agriculturist,
R/o.Khamadolli, Tq: Haliyal,
Dist: Uttara Kannada.

.....petitioners

[Represented by Sri.G.T.N., Advocate]

V/s

The State by Haliyal Police,
Represented by the Public Prosecutor,
Tq: Yellapur, Dist: Uttara Kannada.

.....**Respondent**

[Represented by learned Public Prosecutor]

ORDER

1. It is a petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita for the grant of bail to the petitioners.
2. It is the contention of the petitioners that the respondent has registered in Crime No.45/2026 for the offences punishable under Secs.115(2), 74, 352, 109 and 351(2) r/w. Sec.190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and they have not committed any offence and they have been falsely implicated and they are permanent resident of the addresses shown and the first information report does not show any intention or motive on the part of the petitioners to commit the alleged offences and they have no past criminal antecedent and they are ready to cooperate to the investigation and to offer necessary surety and hence, have prayed for their enlargement on bail.
3. The prosecution has filed the objections denying all the contentions of the petitioners and has contended that if they are enlarged on bail, they may commit similar offences and they may hamper the investigation and tamper with prosecution witnesses and hence, has prayed for dismissal of the petition.
4. I have heard the arguments.

5. The following points arise for my consideration are:

1. Whether the petitioners are entitled for bail as sought for?

2. What Order?

6. My findings on the above points are as follows, for the following:-

Point No. 1 : In the **Negative**.

Point No. 2 : As per final order.

REASONS

7. **Point No. 1 :**

a. It is not in dispute that the I.O. has registered a crime in Crime No.45/2026 for the offences punishable under Secs.115(2), 74, 352, 109 and 351(2) r/w. Sec.190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

b. It is not in dispute that the offences alleged are punishable with death or imprisonment for life.

c. On perusal of the materials on record, it gets clear that, the charge-sheet has not been so far filed.

d. Whether the petitioners were having intention or motive, is a matter to be decided on trial.

e. If the petitioners are enlarged on bail, there is every possibility of the petitioners hampering the investigation and tampering with the prosecution witnesses and they may threaten the prosecution witnesses.

f. Hence, I am of the opinion that, at this stage the petitioners have not made up any ground to grant them the bail.

g. However, the petitioners may move bail application on filing of the charge-sheet.

h. Hence, I answer the above point accordingly.

8. Point No. 2 :

For the reasons discussed herein-above, I proceed to pass the following: -

ORDER

1. The petition filed by petitioners for grant of bail in Crime No.45/2026 of Haliyal P.S., for the offences punishable under Secs.115(2), 74, 352, 109 and 351(2) r/w. Sec.190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, is hereby dismissed.

2. The petition is accordingly disposed off.

(Dictated to Steno, directly on the computer, typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this 10th day of April, 2026).